

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM BRADFORD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:03CV1699 CDP
)	
DORN SCHOFFMAN, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before me on plaintiff's motion to amend the case management order. In support of this motion, plaintiff claims that an extension of time is warranted because plaintiff has yet to receive a ruling on his motion to compel. Plaintiff's motion to compel alleged that defendants had refused to comply with plaintiff's discovery requests. Accordingly, I ordered defendants to show cause why plaintiff's motion to compel should not be granted. Defendants responded that they had complied with plaintiff's discovery requests. Although plaintiff claims that defendants failed to provide complete responses to his discovery requests, he failed to attach defendants' responses to his motion or reply brief. Therefore, the Court is unable to determine whether plaintiff is entitled to compel additional information from defendants. As it is plaintiff's burden to support his motion by furnishing the Court with relevant information and he has failed to do so, the motion to compel will


be denied.

I will grant plaintiff a limited extension of time, up to and including **November 15, 2005**, to complete all discovery in this case. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file motions for summary judgment is denied. **All other deadlines remain in full force and effect.**

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel [#40] is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to amend the case management order [#46] is granted in part and denied in part as stated above.



CATHERINE D. PERRY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 7th day of November, 2005.